

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 19, 29, 33 and 34 have been cancelled. Claims 2, 5, 7, 13, 17, 20, 23, 24, 25, 28, 30, 32 and 35 have been amended, without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been introduced. Support for the amended claims is found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings as originally filed. Twenty-nine (29) claims are pending and remain for consideration. Favorable reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Objection

Claim 35 was objected to because of an informality: namely, in the eighth line of the claim, the claim language "one or more" should have read "plurality of." The claim has been amended accordingly. This amendment was made to correct a minor typographical error. It was not made to avoid prior art or for purposes related to patentability. Although not objected to, claim 25 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error, namely, the word "having" in line 2 has been changed to "has."

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 6, 13-16, 19, 29, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,076,209 to Paul. Claims 1, 6, 19, 29, 33 and 34 have been cancelled. Claims 13-16 should be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth herein below.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,286,283 to Bertoldo. Claims 5 and 23 should be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth herein below.

Allowed Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge that claim 12 has been allowed.

Applicants also acknowledge that claims 2-4, 7-11, 17, 18, 20-22, 24-28 and 30-32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 2, 7, 17, 20, 24, 28, 30 and 32 have been so rewritten and thus should be in condition for allowance.

Finally rejected claims 5, 13 and 23 have been amended to depend from claims 2 and 20, and thus also should be in condition for allowance. Finally rejected claims 14-16 depend from claims 13, and thus also should be in condition for allowance.

Applicants further acknowledge that claim 35 is objected because of an informality, but would be allowable if amended to correct the informality. Claim 35 has been so amended and thus should be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and above remarks, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.